

CUSF General Meetings 1999-2000.

Draft minutes of all meetings

Minutes

CUSF General Meeting, UMB

September 14, 1999

Present: BSU: Drs. Organ, Petulante; CSC: Drs. Arthur, Phillips; FSU: Drs. Ashkeboussi, Nicol; SSU: Drs. Erskine, Parker; TU: Drs. Georgiou, Little, M. Siegel; UB: Dr. Moily; UMB: Drs. Blackmon, Goldman, Havas, Proulx, S. Siegel; UMBC: Drs. Baldwin, Choa, Coates, Lasher; UMBI: Dr. Collins; UMCES: Dr. Morgan; UMCP: Drs. Brannigan, Falk, Gaines, Moses; UMES: Drs. Chapin, Rebach; UMUC: Dr. Onye, USMH: Dr. Bryan

The meeting was called to order at 10 AM. President David Ramsey and Joe McLaughlin, Chair of the Faculty Assembly, brought greetings from the campus. Since this was the first meeting of the academic year, the CUSF representatives also briefly introduced themselves.

Dr. Charles Middleton, the UMS Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, presented part of the report from USMH, indicating that, in his view, the reaction at the Presidents' Council to the proposed shared governance document had been mixed and may have been seen by some as too prescriptive in this era of devolution of authority to the campuses, particularly in view of the three-year period of greater campus autonomy created last spring and the desire of campus administrations to act in an extremely timely manner during that window of opportunity. Thus, shared governance may be viewed by administrators as diverse across our diverse institutions.

Dr. Middleton indicated that he saw attention to retirement plans as a critical issue in the coming year, since the USM lag in this area in comparison to peer institutions leaves us at a competitive disadvantage in the recruitment and retention of faculty. Larger university contributions and larger individual matching will probably be needed to improve this situation. There is a similar need to improve retirement health benefits for spouses (now requiring twenty-five years of faculty service). Another area of activity is that of mission statement: most campus mission statements are now in a form close to a finally approvable draft; a USM mission statement should be ready by October 1 and after that a mission statement for USMH (these created without CUSF input). Because of last spring's legislation, some of these mission statements are short-term and will be done over to reflect the new governance structure. It is clear that any legislative commitment to a high level of state support for the USM (say to bring faculty salaries closer to the desired guidelines) will require a parallel accountability demonstrating the growing eminence of the system and its institutions, in terms of national rankings, graduation and retention rates, and parallel growth in external funding.

During his Executive Committee Report, Dr. Steve Havas reiterated the importance of shared governance as a highest priority item for CUSF this year. This topic will come up at the meeting with Senate Chairs in October and at the Presidents' Council in December. In order to keep the Board of Regents alerted to CUSF activity, it may be wise to send copies of our minutes

to the BOR. In the matter of faculty salaries, we need somehow to manage a balance between attracting new scholars of eminence and avoiding the salary compression that is so damaging to morale on the campuses. Dr. Havas also agreed that future agendas would be written in a more traditional form with items such as New Business and Old Business.

The election of an additional at-large member of the CUSF Executive Committee resulted in the unanimous choice of Professor Carl Smith from UMCP.

Discussion of issues and plans for CUSF meeting for 1999-2000 closely followed the list on the meeting agenda:

- a. Shared governance (discussed above)
- b. Interactions and the importance of communications with campus Senates
- c. Discussion of critical issues with BOR members (and the possibility of visits from the new BOR chair and chairs of the BOR Finance and Ed Policy Committees)
- d. Faculty salaries (some discussion above, more in the afternoon below)
- e. Unionization of faculty (and the possibility of inviting representatives from various unions to come together to one of our meetings for discussion)
- f. Distance education (and questions of USM administrative enthusiasm and of the process of evaluation of program and course quality)
- g. The extended use of full-time lecturers (replacing part-time people with no benefits with full-time people with low salaries and small benefits instead of hiring more tenure-track faculty: the Pathways committee looking into this has made recommendations on the professionalization of the holders of these positions, but recognizes that there are considerable cost considerations involved.)
- h. The change in FY 2001 funding to a formula-based system using head-count and retention/graduation rates
- i. The work of the Pathways committees (discussion in the afternoon)
- j. Other issues from the rest of the Council membership (including interstate university systems).

The chair reminded the representatives of the Chancellor's reception on 10/2/99.

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved after the change of the name Feathers to Phillips, Curry to Currie, the correction of the spelling of Ashkebossi, and a request for consistency adjustment of the minutes to reflect the current actual text of the Shared Governance document.

During lunch, the CUSF standing committees, including the new members who had added their names to committee lists this morning, had their first meetings.

After lunch, T. J. Bryan continued the USMH report and distributed a folder of relevant documentation to all members. She began with a history of the Pathways document and the ensuing committees. In the matter of faculty workload (and in particular the handling of workload for faculty involved in laboratories and other activities that tend to make contract hours

more extensive than student credit hours), she pointed out changes in reporting procedures, a change in direction looking more toward department overall load than to individual load, but noted that 'exception' reports would be continued for faculty whose load any particular semester did not fit the norm. The faculty salary data next presented all came from the AAUP database (not from the BOR or USMH) but still reflected the usual confusion between faculty with contracts of various lengths and with dollars coming from various funding sources. T. J. Bryan reminded us of the Chairs conference on the 29th at UMBC and of the plan to keep a global list of grant availability for faculty development (across the campuses).

The first reports of the newly constituted CUSF committees followed. The Faculty Affairs Committee will consider the question of unionization (and the invitation of union representative to a CUSF meeting), the faculty development awards (and their continued centralized funding); Professor Goldman will be Vice Chair. The Administrative and Fiscal Committee will check with the BOR and deal with administrative and fiscal issues; Professor Nicol will be the Vice Chair. The Educational Policy Committee will consider the role of interdisciplinary faculty, part-time faculty, distance education and K-16 seamlessness; Professor Coates will be the Vice Chair. The Legislative Committee will concern itself with legislative liaison when the state legislature is working on issues of USM funding and governance. Since all members of this committee newly joined at this CUSF meeting, the CUSF Executive Committee will select their chairs at the next Executive Committee meeting in early October.

The meeting was adjourned slightly before 2 PM.

**(VERY) PRELIMINARY DRAFT
MINUTES
CUSF GENERAL MEETING
OCTOBER 18, 1999**

Present: BSU: Organ and Petulante; CES: Ray Morgan (alternate); CSC: Arthur; FSU: Ashkeboussi and Nicol; SSU: Erskine and Lada; TU: Gerogiou, Little and Siegel; UB: Swaim; UMB Blackmon, Goldman, Havas, and Proulx; UMBC: Baldwin; UMCP: Falk and Gaines; UMUC: Clarence Mann (alternate); USMH: Bryan and Middleton.

President Gira brought greetings from the Frostburg State University campus, emphasizing, cooperative programs with other campuses, campus renovations and the great importance of shared governance on the Frostburg campus. She indicated that the current 1996 policy is working well and Frostburg, that the CUSF proposed policy leaves out staff and students, so that if a new policy were to be adopted, we would really need three documents or some combined document which would include faculty (predominating), staff and students, and, at the same time, better reflect the differences among the campuses. Questions of faculty evaluation of administrators also arose.

Professor Siegel (TSU) undertook to take notes for creation of these minutes. The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as modified (second paragraph: "his"/"the"; third

paragraph: “may have been seen”; fifth paragraph: “will be redone”).

At the Executive Committee meeting, Charles B. Lowry, chair of the system-wide library council had reported that the system of ranks and permanent status (somewhat like faculty ranks and tenure), obtained by the professional librarians in 1996, was now being lost under the current reorganization, and asked for faculty support in the librarians’ attempt to retain this system. Discussion led to the suggestion of inviting library representatives to a CUSF meeting.

It was announced that Professor William Falk (UMCP) would serve as Chair of the CUSF Legislative Affairs Committee.

In the matter of the proposed Shared Governance document, Professor Havas reported that the Presidents and Chancellor did not seem supportive, citing difficulties with wording, with too great a degree of specificity, a need to incorporate staff and student shared governance, claims that the proposal was one-size-fits-all, etc. The idea of a campus-by-campus Report Card on Shared Governance from Professor Gains (UMCP) generated considerable discussion., including the possibility of basing such periodic reports on a checklist generated from the principles enumerated in our document or on AAUP principles. It is also not clear exactly what result has come from the earlier, less conclusive survey of campus governance done in 1997 and from the more recent survey (organized to overcome some of the imperfections of the earlier survey).

Professor Goldman moved to refer the current CUSF document back to committee for additional work taking into account the responses to the current version from the Presidents (due at the beginning of December) and the Board of Regents. Discussion centered around the meaning of “faculty role”, the specificity of the document and whether we want to deal with strictly faculty governance or shared governance by all parties in the system. A motion to close debate passed, after which the main motion was defeated eight to ten with one abstention.

Since there are funds available from the tobacco settlement and there is an opportunity to involve all campuses in smoking abatement programs in their local communities, one of the campus Presidents (Ramsey , UMB) has suggested that interested parties on all the campuses become involved in such activities as expeditiously as possible. Discussion lead to suggestion of linking such work with alcohol education, or perhaps current student services activities, and to the possibility of setting up an RFP process for the campuses, since some funds may be available.

T. J. Bryan (ASMH) reported that the USM mission statement had be written and approved (BOR EdPolicy Committee and then the full BOR), but might well need to be written again in view of the mandate of new mission statements in Bill 682 last spring (although the bill requires mission statements for the various campuses and does not require any for USM). CUSF was not consulted in this process.

Professor Gaines (UMCP) moved that we censure or take other suitable remedial action against the Chancellor of USM for failure to involved CUSF in one of the most significant actions by University administration. Vice President Middleton (USMH) apologized for the oversight,

confusion of meetings, meetings cancelled by the violent weather, etc., that led to this oversight and suggested that it would be possible to ask that the USM Mission Statement be revisited in order to make it a stronger document before sending it back to the board. The Bill 682 deadlines for a new statewide plan by April 30, 2000, followed by revised mission statements by June 30, 2000, may leave faculty (particularly nine and a half month faculty) out of the loop on some campuses. Discussion followed concerning the history of the adoption of the current documents and of the future of MHEC and USM in revamped the university system with its stronger emphasis on local autonomy. Senator Tydings' State Plan committee will have faculty representation (one each from UMUC, UMCP and SSU) in its discussion of economic development, access, affordability, K-16 issues; Vice Chancellor Middleton will bring the relevant issues to us ahead of time so that we can be involved.

Professor Gaines agreed to an adjustment of his motion, changing it to having a strongly-worded letter (drafted by Professor Havas and written with him by the ExCOM) expressing chagrin with the unilateral action on behalf of the Chancellor's Office, including an expression of our unhappiness at having been ignored. This motion passed thirteen to two.

Information about faculty awards and grants will be distributed in the packet sent to Senate Chairs, and will also be available at the Department Chairs' Conference (October 29, over one hundred and twenty-five registrations!) and on our CUSF web-site. Since CUSF has responsibility for the evaluation of proposal submitted, we need to appoint an appropriate committee to do so. Professor Baldwin (UMBC) will chair the committee for the faculty development grants.

Nate Chapman, the Chair of the BOR, will be coming to one of our CUSF meetings shortly. Other BOR committee heads may also be willing to attend. We might well also appoint CUSF representatives to attend critical BOR committee meeting (e.g., Finance Committee, Educational Policy Committee). It may be advantageous for us to send various CUSF minutes to the BOR, once the minutes have been approved.

The matter of Presidential Searches and Search committees was recommended for inclusion in the agenda of the next general CUSF meeting. The question of the limitation of CUSF to tenure and tenure-track faculty was sent to the Administrative and Fiscal Affairs Committee for consideration.. Another important new issue is finding a suitable orientation method for new people [is this CUSF new or campus new?]

DRAFT MINUTES
CUSF General Meeting
November 17, 1999

Present: BSU: Organ, Petulante; CSC: Arthur; FSU: Ashkeboussi, Nichol; SSU: Erskine, Parker; TU: Georgiou, Little, M. Siegel; UB: Moily, Gibson (alt); UMB: Blackmon, Goldman, (Havas), Proulx, S. Siegel; UMBC: Baldwin, Choa, Coates, (Lasher), Berge (alt.); UMBI: Collins; UMCES: Morgan; UMCP: Brannigan, Falk, Gaines, Moses, Smith; UMES: Chapin,

Rebach; UMUC: Onye, USMH: Bryan

After self-introductions by the members and greetings from the campus (President Freeman Hrabowski and Senate Chair Linda Baker), Nathan Chapman, the new Chair of the Board of Regents spoke. He explained his view of faculty as the backbone of the system and regents as advocates for the faculty. At a time when we are expecting major increases in capital budgets and are working to increase operating budgets to better approach the eighty-fifth percentile of our peers, he reminded us of the necessity of always preparing to be accountable to the legislature and the state that provide these funds. Particularly in the area of technical literacy (under consideration by the BOR Ed Policy Committee) and access/equipment (under consideration by the BOR Technology Committee), we find ourselves in another arena in which we must run just to keep in place. The whole area of K-16 and teacher training (particularly to meet staffing needs in some political subdivisions) is one that is upon us requiring quicker solutions than we are accustomed to creating. The recent changes in system-wide governance give all campuses a chance for entrepreneurship (a possible source of revenue in times when the state budgets are not so strong) and also an opportunity for collaboration with other campuses, including the community colleges and private institutions.

In response to Regent Chapman's remarks, CUSF members expressed concern for the necessity of repairing and renovating current facilities, reminders of the difficulty of IT catch-up when our peers are also moving forward rapidly, and several matters of compensating faculty and staff to ensure continuing system growth: retirement benefits (including the \$600 match made available to everyone else except faculty and the weaker early retirement package offered to faculty), nine versus nine and one half month contracts, the "lumpiness" of the dispersement of merit increases, and the need to attract long-time staff for infrastructure (especially in IT). Issues of representation also arose: the proposed Shared Governance Document (Chapin, Collins and Gaines will consider possible revisions of wording), faculty representation in presidential searches, collective bargaining, faculty representation on the BOR, and limited faculty input into the new Master Plan for Higher Education. Any change we make in CUSF representation – currently limited to tenured/tenure-track faculty – will also need BOR attention. Regent Chapman indicated that CUSF should bring its shared governance document to the BOR for consideration, regardless of whether or not the USM presidents endorsed it.

The minutes of the October meeting were approved after typographical adjustments and the Chart of Absences distributed.

The Chair reported on the Governor's Conference on Higher Education, the Governor discussed his visions of excellence (including questions of cost and of how to measure excellence), of community involvement and involvement with businesses, but did not indicate much enthusiasm for the "eighty-fifth percentile" idea mentioned above (particularly since peer selection seems to be a politically loaded consideration). The Chair distributed a copy of the letter expressing CUSF concern about our non-inclusion in the writing of the system mission statement. Concerning the Technology Meeting with regents and campus representatives, Professor Carl Smith distributed copies of his presentation representing CUSF, to the Technology Meeting with regents and campus representatives. A number of the topics from this message came up in the

CUSF reactions to Regent Chapman remarks above. At the MHEC Faculty Affairs Committee meeting, attended by Professors George Georgiou and Tom Erskine, it was decided to add five new members to the corresponding MHEC-FAC to represent part-time/non-tenure-track faculty. The working conditions and contributions of such faculty are of great concern to CUSF, particularly the fifty percent limit on their use (and the exceptions to that limit for UMUC, Phoenix and Sojourner-Douglas). The corresponding Pathways committee will advocate using fewer part-time people, replacing them with more highly qualified people carrying full-time loads and responsibilities. There were also announcements of the winning of the TU Service Award by Professor Joyce Little and that this meeting will be the last for long-time CUSF representative Professor Steve Rebach.

T. J. Bryan distributed a folder with the material for the System Report. Much of the discussion here centered on the contract hours study done in connection with the Faculty Workload Policy. After reminding us again of the history of this policy, Bryan emphasized that (1) current policy is based on the academic unit and not on the individual faculty member as the measure for contact/credit hours generated, that (2) even before the change allowing contact hours came in to effect in July, 1999, several campuses were already taking contact hours into consideration (instead of sticking strictly to credit hours), (3) that institutions are allowed to take other factors, such as advising and modality of instruction into consideration. Institutions will need to establish formal policies in all of these matters. A possible 'best practice' example appears on page twelve of the document distributed. Other matters presented included the successful Chairs Conference (114 attended, next years' fall conference at BSU with a possible spring conference for those who will become chairs) and the upcoming Regents Faculty Awards (nominations due in by December 10, 1999, with recommendations to the BOR by January 21, 2000) CUSF members Brannigan, Collins, Moily, S. Siegel, and Petulante will sit on the committee to evaluate the applications. A motion to refer discussion of the division of these awards among the campuses to the CUSF Ed Policy committee passed after discussion.

After lunchtime committee meetings, CUSF committees reported on their activities. The Faculty Affairs Committee presented a motion that "CUSF endorse in principle the recommendation that a system-wide non-tenure category of faculty be created for librarians." The motion passed unanimously. In addition the Committee recommended that the theme for the next round (fall 2000) of the Faculty Awards be 'non-academic partnerships'. A draft revision of the Mission Statement of the University System of Maryland was distributed. After some suggestions from the floor for further revisions of this statement, a motion to "adopt the sense of the revised language as a suggestion to the BOR for its consideration" passed. E-mail to the all members of the Faculty Affairs Committee can be sent to facaff-cusf@umail.umd.edu (or to the Chair, Professor Ken Baldwin at kbaldwin@umbc.edu).

The Administrative and Fiscal Affairs Committee reported that it will begin sending a representative to the corresponding BOR committee (open sessions only) tomorrow November 18. They reminded us that we must get materials on matters of changing our rules concerning the Past President, etc. to the BOR for official approval.

The Educational Policy Committee recommended that we change the distribution of the

Faculty Awards beginning in the 2000-2001 year to a system in which one award will be given to a faculty member from each of the current groups of institutions, with the third award going to a faculty member from either group as seems appropriate to the evaluators. A motion to this effect passed unanimously. Those with contributions to make concerning the workload report should send them to M. Siegel (siegel@towson.edu). This committee will also send a representative to the corresponding BOR committee.

The Legislative Affairs Committee is currently considering legal status of faculty collective bargaining in view of expressed interests from CUSF in hearing from possible collective bargaining agencies.

The Chancellor will be present to speak at the December CUSF meeting.

The meeting was adjourned shortly before two o'clock.

DRAFT MINUTES
CUSF General Meeting
December 20, 1999

Present: BSU: Organ; CES: Morgan; CSC: Arthur; FSU: Nicol, Moore (alt.); SSU: Lade; TU: Georgiou, Little, M. Siegel; UB: Moily, Gibson (alt.); UMB: Blackmon, Goldman, Havas, Proulx, S. Siegel; UMBC: Choa, Coates; UMBI: Collins; UMBC: Brannigan, Falk, Gaines, Moses, Smith; UMES: Chapin; UMUC: Onye; UMSH: Bryan

The meeting was called to order shortly after ten o'clock. Professor John Organ introduces Dr. Wendell Holloway, the Acting President at BSU who brought us greetings from the campus. He reminded us that "It's all about business", and indicated the radical change he felt that all universities would be going through to adjust to the business model of education, urging a lot of hand-holding to carry faculty through this process, but reminding us that shared governance had to be balanced by the realities of "in-time performance". Professor White, the Chair of the BSU Faculty Council (an early CUSF Vice Chair and Chair) also brought greetings from the campus.

The minutes were approved.

The Chair reported that the Presidents had deferred final consideration of our Shared Governance document until their January meeting. Just the discussion of this document has seemingly led to improvements in shared governance on some of the campuses. Working together with CUSS to get a final document may be necessary to get the support of the Presidents, but their idea of incorporating the AGB statement by reference causes serious problems from our point of view (e.g., running schools as businesses, keeping faculty off the BOR, etc.) It might be possible instead to incorporate our document by reference in the BOR statement now in place.

Professor Martha Siegel reminded us of the significance of the K-16 work being done, particularly since success on the Praxis examination for teacher educators is closely connected to federal funding. She reported that the meeting of the AAAC at UB had dealt with the workload issue (about which Drs. Bryan and Miyares have talked with the legislative analysts). Many of the decisions in this area are at the discretion of the campus (Presidents); our issue of contact hours was not the central direction for the Pathways committee document on workload. In addition, the AAAC considered the role of faculty/administrators (department chairs on up). Dr. T. J. Bryan reminded us that such positions are held “at will” (of the campus President) and that she was drawing up a set of “best practice” policies. While UMUC is still quite ready to provide assistance to other campuses in the matter of distance education, the Institute for Distance Education does not seem to be flourishing.

Professor Carl Smith reported that the BOR Finance Committee had concerned itself with bringing exempt staff pay up to the level of that at peer universities.

Professor T. J. Bryan reported that librarians will remain in their current status until a formal status decision is made in March. There seems to be no opposition to the proposal to have non-tenure faculty status for the librarians. The folder she passed out included information on the Regents Faculty awards (many more nomination this year and a new category, mentoring), a listing of the members of the Graduate Research Council (advisory to the AAAC; a possible avenue for getting better mention of graduate studies and research in future planning documents), and a listing of the IP Committee membership (seven out of thirteen are faculty, but no faculty attorney; report due by the end of the academic year).

The Chancellor discussed a new era for USM: a public corporation with its own personnel and purchasing policies, a new statewide plan for higher education coming up (probably more influential than its predecessors since it was designed for buy-in by all groups in the state), new levels of state fiscal support (tripled support for capital projects and double increases, perhaps for three years or more, in operating budgets), a new model for determining campus peer institutions (both current peers for setting goals of support at the seventy-fifth percentile, and aspirational peers), and management by results (responsibility for determining the “how” left to the campuses and the eventual accountability of the campuses for attaining eminence).

The Statewide Plan for Higher Education now being written for the SBHE should appear publicly by the middle of January for wide general commentary. The final version will appear on April 30 , followed by a June 30 deadline for new mission statements from all the campuses in consonance with the new plan. It would be wise to get faculty on the campuses working on such statements as soon as the preliminary version of the Plan appears in January.

The new current peers for each institution depend on data for over five hundred public four-year institutions that the Chancellor has been collecting for over fifteen years. An eight-criterion analysis determines groups of about sixty current peers for most institutions who will also be performance and aspirational peers for most of those institutions for the first year. After that, institutions will be able to make some adjustments in the peer groups.

While eminence may be difficult to define, it probably requires being in the top ten percent of comparable institutions, so that setting the goal at the seventy-fifth percentile (of the moving target) rather than the older eighty-fifth percentile (of the available figures which are always a year or so late) seems sensible.

The most significant predictor of success in K-12 success for all students is teacher quality so that the work of all the USM faculty in preparing strong teachers, not just that of Education Departments, is critical. Campuses need to make teacher education central to their mission or get out of the business. Changes must also come in the primary/secondary arena: proper pay and conditions to attract strong candidates, real pay differential for master teachers, the use of the best teachers for the most needy students, etc.

In the area of information technology, the Chancellor reported that the BOR is interested both in well-defined standards for information infrastructures at all institutions (instead of the present variance from state-of-the-art to state-of-the-unbelievable) and in minimal standards of technical literacy for all students graduating from USM institutions. There is now agreement that such standards need to be set by faculty at the campuses. Presently they would include competence at using such software as wordprocessors, spreadsheets, databases, presentation software, and webpage creators, matters often taught in secondary schools now, with a recognition that IT is a rapidly developing area so that criteria can be neither dependent on the skill levels of university faculty educated many years ago nor left without revision for periods of several years as some other general education requirements often are.

After a period of committee meetings during lunch, Professor Carl Smith reported that the Administrative and Fiscal Affairs Committee considered two constitutional matters. One is the statement in our constitution requiring CUSF members to be tenure/tenure-track faculty (although the question of whether other faculty take part in their election is a campus-determined decision). The Committee recommended making no change in this area. A motion by Professor Larry Goldman to refer this matter back to committee for further consideration and to check our constitution for consistency with recently-passed BOR rules on general faculty participation in shared governance passed after discussion. The matter of the proposed change in our constitution, clarifying the position of the Past Chair as a non-voting ex-officio member of CUSF, which we passed last June, was referred to the CUSF Chair for transmission to the BOR.

Professor Larry Goldman reported a committee recommendation concerning the Faculty Development Awards that the word describing the theme be changed from "Outreach" to "Partnership". In the matter of informational visit of union representatives to CUSF, we eventually agreed that the visit would take place at the February meeting, that both those already agreeing to attend and those currently invited would receive a list of questions from the group. This way, the various union representatives could either come prepared to answer our questions (or decide not to participate). Questions and issues of concern for this discussion should be sent to Professor Lillian Blackmon lblackmo@ped5.ab.umd.edu after January 1, 2000.

Professor Martha Siegel emphasized that the workload plan now emphasized the academic unit (and not the individual faculty member) as the reporting unit; this will be discussed again at

the Senate Chair's meeting on January 28, as will the topic of what "service" now means as a part of the faculty load, and the creation of technical literacy statements by the individual campuses. She also reported on the difficulty of USM campuses in approving SBHE program approval when single schools not in the USM object to the program. Professor Peter Lade also reminded us of the need to keep up with the work of the committee creating an IT plan for the system.

**DRAFT MINUTES
CUSF GENERAL MEETING
JANUARY 14, 2000**

Present: BSU: Organ, Petulante; CSC: Arthur; FSU: Ashkeboussi, Nicol; SSU: Parker; TU: Georgiou, Little, Siegel; UMB: Blackmon, Goldman, Havas, Proulx, Siegel; UMBC: Baldwin, Choa, Coates, Lasher; UMBI: Collins; UMBC: Brannigan, Moses; UMES: Chapin, UMUC: Onye; USM: Bryan, Middleton

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 and the minutes of the previous meeting were approved with the addition at the top of the list of those present.

The report from the CUSF Chair Steve Havas centered on the shared governance document. Meeting with the staff council CUSS led to some agreement that the inclusion of the AGB statement by reference could be ill advised, but to no firm conclusions. Likewise, meeting with the Presidents showed some support for the CUSF document, indication by some presidents that there seemed to be no problem for the document to address, and a decision not to vote on the document but rather send it to a committee (President Hoke of TU, the CUSS Chair, the CUSF Chair, the Student organization Chair) for further consideration and possible modification of wording. Our own Faculty Affairs Committee was also directed to look at the wording, particularly in those places where the Presidents indicated difficulties. It was also announced that Professor Robert Gaines of UMCP was resigning from CUSF.

The reports from AAAC and BOR Committee representatives were quite brief because the committees will begin meeting again next week.

The MHEC-FAC does need recommendations from us for the IP committee.

Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Affairs Joe Vivona reported on the budget, anticipating two consecutive years of 4% COLA available that would be committed solely for that purpose (with additional merit money not to be distributed evenly across-the-board). From his point of view our goals with the Legislature are holding on to the budget, demonstrating accountability (not only academically but in construction of facilities at a time when so many will be going up at once: adding support for technology and building maintenance is critical here), demonstrating that last year's governance bill is working well, and keeping up momentum toward a better understanding of the essential nature of the USM to the state. Campuses and faculty need to support the funding guidelines (based on large pools of "funding peers" and "aspirational peers"), assure accountability, plan so that a large percentage of the baby boom echo students in

Maryland choose the USM, work on compressing tuition, increasing competitiveness, get construction projects done, and manifest their strengths to the community.

The capital budget for the coming five year period will be \$831 million (in comparison to the previous \$470 million), with thirty-eight fully constructed projects, many to be finished in the first three years (so heavily funded in the first two years of the cycle). In approaching per-student funding targets, it is anticipated that we will reach 78% in FY 2000, 87% in FY 2001 and 95% in FY 2002. This will require funds for enrollment growth and for retention and recruitment of faculty, especially those above the assistant professor level. Although the state provides only 32% of operating budgets for the USM institutions overall, the figure rises to about 60% for instruction.

Associate Vice Chancellor for State Relations Frank Commenda spoke about the legislative session just starting. He anticipates no major tax change except the elimination of the unpopular inheritance tax and perhaps a speed-up of the income tax decrease now in effect. Since education represents such a large share of the discretionary budget, we need to defend our budget through communication with our legislators and by giving testimony. Given recent cost over-runs in construction, there will be an effort to bring costs back into line, although a move to require “prevailing wages” in construction at all levels may complicate this. There are also plans to raise the state contribution to retirement plans from 7.25% to 9.25% (plus a 2% mandatory contribution from the plan holder. We need to work collectively, speaking with one voice on these matters. There may be some action on collective bargaining for USM staff, although CUSS is opposed. No action is anticipated in matters concerning domestic-partner benefits nor academic scheduling.

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Charles Middleton reminded us that there is no longer a “headquarters” but rather a USM Office. The earliest draft of the State Plan for Higher Education will go to the Tydings Committee today and from there to MHEC, perhaps with a version prepared for web posting by next week. This will lead to a requirement for new mission statements by the USM institutions within two months of the announcement of the final version of April 30, so that it would be wise for faculty at all the institutions to become involved in writing the mission statements as soon as possible. The new format will require statements that are considerably briefer and broader, facilitating new program development (and requiring careful attention to quality control and demonstrable results). Since the Tydings Committee is looking for buy-in in this document by all stake-holders, they will be encouraging lots of discussion and may go through three to five versions of the document before the April 30 deadline.

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs T. J. Bryan presented all members with a folder of materials including i. Information on the Regents’ Faculty Awards (included recommended changes in direction and in procedures); ii. A report on Faculty in Administrative Roles; iii. A report on progress in moving librarians to non-tenure-track faculty ranks; iv. Information on the Council on Research and Graduate Education; v. A report on the IP Committee; vi. Information on an RFP (due February 1) for recruitment and retention of minority personnel in sciences; vii. Information on the technical fluency goals of the BOR; viii. The contact-hours study (in matters of “individual studies”, the formula has been adjusted but there is

no institutional flexibility whereas in matter of contact hours, there is considerable institutional flexibility).

After lunch, our Administrative and Fiscal Affairs Committee Chair Dave Nichol indicated that study of BOR materials revealed requirements for inclusion of non-tenure-track faculty in governance at the institutional level but not specifically at the CUSF level, but that the existence of two versions of the CUSF constitutions on different websites was a matter for concern requiring resolution through further study by the committee.

Faculty Affairs Committee Chair Ken Baldwin announced that, at our February 14 meeting, there would be two hours of presentations (10:30-12:30) by representatives of various union groups: AAUP, AFT, NEA, SEIU and AFSCME.

There was no report from the Educational Policy Committee.

There was no Old Business.

Under New Business, UMB representative Larry Goldman expressed concern at the large amount of time we spend hearing reports, whether from external or internal groups and the small amount of time that we spend in group discussion and group determination of CUSF policy and recommendations. In order to provide some more time for such discussion, we agreed to try starting our next general meeting at 9:30 instead of at 10:00.

In other matters, further comments on student evaluation should be e-mailed to CUSF Chair Steve Havas for inclusion in his discussion with concerned students; the entire matter of student evaluation was referred to the Educational Policy Committee. The matter of campus endorsements of commercial products was referred to the Executive Committee for consideration and for inclusion in the agenda, after which the meeting was adjourned.

**DRAFT MINUTES
CUSF GENERAL MEETING
February 14, 2000 at UMBI**

Present: BSU: Drs. Organ, Petulante; CES: Dr. Morgan; FSU: Drs. Ashkeboussi, Nicol; SSU: Dr. Lade; TU: Drs. Little, Siegel; UB: Dr. Gibson; UMB: Drs. Blackmon, Havas, Proulx, Palumbo (alt), Siegel; UMBC: Drs. Baldwin, Choa, Coates, Lasher; UMBI: Dr. Collins; UMCP Drs. Brannigan, Smith; UMES: Dr. Chapin; UMUC: Dr. Onye; USM Drs. Bryan, Middleton

The meeting was called to order at 10:00. Dr. James Lovelace, UMBI Vice President for Academic Affairs brought greetings from the campus, representing President Dr Hunter-Cevera.

The attendance sheet for this month, the sheet of absences, and a draft version of the January Executive Committee minutes were distributed. The minutes of the January CUSF General Meeting were approved with the change of the name of the President of Towson to Dr.

Hoke Smith, the change of affiliation of CUSF members Drs. Brannigan and Smith to UMCP, and the inclusion of mention of the discussion of faculty evaluation prompted by a request from the Chair of the system student council.

The Chair, Dr. Havas reported the resignation of representative Dr. Moses of UMCP, continuing discussion with system student leadership of their concerns, continuing work of the committee appointed to deal with the Shared Governance document, the need for two recommendations from us for members of the Board of Regents Academic Advising Oversight Committee (by tomorrow, February 15th), and the continuing confusion about the various versions of our constitution (we will try to consult Dr. Ira Block). He also requested nominations for CUSF Executive Committee, noting that he did not wish to serve another term as chair.

Dr. Middleton, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, indicated that there would be a new (more balanced) draft of the State Plan for Higher Education available on the web shortly, that the legislative budget hearings are going well so far (4% COLA salary increase in each of the next two years, merit money, increased contribution for TIAA/CREF members, etc.), that the Board of Regents has approved an Information Technology Proficiency requirement (the details of which are to be determined by the schools and departments on the various campuses with campus reporting this May about their plans), and that the Intellectual Property Committee is drafting options to be presented at open forums before a final version of a policy is created and submitted in time for December 2000 approval.

Representatives from the American Association of University Professors (Patrick Shaw), the Service Employees International Union (Eileen Kirlin and Stephen Poor), the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (Darrin Spann) and the American Federation of Teachers (Gary Stevenson), introduced the groups they represented, explaining how these groups worked in the process of representation and collective bargaining for teachers (and distributing informational material). Discussion centered on the relationship between collective bargaining and shared faculty governance, the bills now in the Maryland legislature concerning collective bargaining right of UM non-faculty and faculty employees, the amount of time commitment on the part of faculty needed to assure effective representative, the need for agency fees and service fees regularly changed to faculty electing not to join the union, dues (3/4% to 1.5% of gross salary), conflicts between collective bargaining and individual faculty negotiation with administrators, the negative CUSS position on unionization, and the financial and other advantages coming from collective bargaining.

After lunch, Dr. Bryan continued the UMS report commenting on items distributed earlier by mail and distributed a copy of the current ART policy for comparison. Although some of the deadlines for grant applications mentioned in the mailing had passed, it may be possible to send late applications. The Presidential Search policy, described as somewhat vague so as to allow for flexibility was referred to our Administrative Affairs Committee since it has no mention of required elected faculty members of search committees. CUSF recommended various modifications of the document on faculty status of librarians, including the removal of all mention of 'insubordination', and the removal of the parallels drawn between library and other faculty ranks (because librarians will not go through the general campus promotion and tenure

procedure). Most of the rest of the policy is modeled either on current library policy or corresponding current faculty policy. Library Dean Dr. Lowry was present to explain the library position on these policies.

Dr. Collins reported that at the Chancellor's Council meeting the need in terms of student demand in that part of the state for undergraduate programs at Shady Grove was acknowledged by the presidents with some reservations about difficulties of faculty travel from distant campuses to do the teaching, that there were reports on shared governance, tuition and fee schedules, the state plan for higher education, the act providing D.C. students with tuition assistance in Maryland and Virginia schools, and the CUSF and CUSS reports (including considerable explication of why CUSS is taking a stance against collective bargaining).

Dr. Coates reported that the Educational Policy committee unanimously approved the IT policy, in addition to hearing reports on campus crime.

Dr. Baldwin, on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, introduced a motion (wording somewhat modified with the assistance of Dr. Brannigan) that "As a statement of principle, CUSF supports the concept that our faculty have the right to decide whether collective bargaining is in their best interest and CUSF supports legislation that will give faculty the right to make such a decision." Once discussion clarified that this was not a response to any specific legislative proposal, the motion passed with only positive votes and abstentions, after which the meeting was adjourned.

DRAFT Minutes
CUSF General Meeting
March 14, 2000

Present: BSU: Dr. Petulante; CES: Dr. Morgan; CSC: Drs. Arthur, Brooks (alternate); FSU: Drs. Ashkeboussi, Nicol; TU: Drs. Little, M. Siegel; UB: Drs. Moily, Gibson; UMB: Drs. Blackmon, Goldman, Havas; UMBC: Drs. Baldwin, Choa, Coates, Lasher; UMBI: Dr. Collins; UMCP: Drs. Brannigan, Falk, Smith; UMES: Dr. Chapin; UMUC: Dr. Onye; USM Offices: Drs. Bryan, Middleton

The meeting was called to order at ten o'clock a.m.. UMCP Provost Dr. Geoffrey brought greetings from the campus, and indicated his concern with the present [unsatisfactory] MHEC draft of the State Plan for Higher Education and the difficulties with the suggested plan to have MHEC direct the regional higher education centers. He was generally supportive of the current version of the Shared Governance document.

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as distributed, once the word "representative" was corrected to read "representation" near the top of the second page.

In the report from the Chair, Dr. Havas indicated that, from our prospective, the most significant activity at the most recent Chancellor's Council meeting was the acceptance of the

CUSF view on changes in the proposed policy on librarians (removal of language directly comparing library and faculty ranks and removal of references to insubordination). At the President's Council, the matter of the shared governance document came up again. There were some objections to the rewritten draft; a vote on its approval will take place at the April meeting. The exact intent and meaning of the proposed legislation on unionization of USM employees also remains somewhat unclear, at least partially because it is difficult to get a reading from an expert not tied to one of the interested parties.

The Nominations committee presented the following candidates: Dr. Chapin for Chair, Dr. M. Siegel for Vice Chair; Dr. Collins for Secretary; Drs. Baldwin and Smith for at-large positions of the Executive Committee. As there were no nominations from the floor, the nominations were closed on the above list of candidates. The official vote will take place at our next meeting.

Dr. M. Siegel reported that the most critical matter for us at the AAAC meeting was discussion of Senate Bill 603 on the Regional Centers of Higher Education. The original draft would give MHEC rather exclusive control over these centers and their programs instead of leaving that control to those institutions making the entrepreneurial decision to present programs there. Dr. Middleton added that the bill would also create an entirely new class of higher educational institutions, the "centers", but would have the positive effect of providing funding for these centers not taken from the budgets of the institutions presenting programs there. A new markup of the bill, made with the help of President Gira, is in the offing.

In the system report, Dr. Middleton indicated that the System Office is continuing with creation of an alternative to the MHEC-proposed State Plan for Higher Education. Quick action is needed because of the legislatively-imposed deadline for completion by the end of next month. He also distributed the format for new campus mission statements (although this format is still undergoing adjustments) and said that there was some possibility that the deadline for submission of the new statements might be extended from the end of June to the end of October to allow for more realistic faculty input. The new Board of Regents policy on information technology fluency will require that all individual programs on all campuses insure that technological fluency appropriate for the students in those programs become part of the programmatic graduation requirements. We are currently just at the beginning of this process, surveying the various campuses to determine which programs are clearly already doing this, which ones are clearly not doing this and which ones are somewhere in between. The parallel information technology policy on minimal standards for the provision of the necessary hardware, software, network connections, maintenance, etc. to meet these fluency requirements will have to deal with the very real costs involved in achieving the BOR mandate for IT fluency, particularly since it is unlikely that full funding for this can be eked out of the current block funds allocated to the campuses.

Dr. Bryan continued the system report, beginning with the work of the Intellectual Property committee: the statement of principles has already been distributed, but the detailed work of the committee has produced a document whose twenty-two pages will require some paring down. The second draft of the faculty workload report, also already distributed, indicates that core faculty contributions are well within the proposed ranges but seem to have reached a plateau after a period of increase. The Council on Research and Graduate Education has been

meeting and, at the request of legislators, prioritizing requests for special funds, so that the legislators are not inundated by individual requests from all the campuses. Information about the winners of the Board of Regents Faculty awards also appears in the material distributed.

Most of the remaining meeting time was devoted to our response to the draft state plan for higher education. A motion, proposed by Dr. Lasher, to *have discussion based of the draft letter distributed by Dr. Havas continue until the lunch break at 12:30* passed. After that discussion took place, a committee consisting Drs. Brannigan, Goldman, and Havas, with the assistance of the secretary, worked during the period of lunch and committee meetings to create the following response, which was unanimously adopted by the body with the understanding that the committee that drafted this resolution would continue to work on the inclusion of appropriate detailed concerns.

CUSF recommends that the proposed SBHE State Plan for Higher Education be rejected in its current form. The plan is unacceptable because it does not respond to the charges it lists for itself on page eight. Its creation did not include adequate stake-holder input. It represents an unwarranted intrusion into institutional governance. It fails to acknowledge the unique characteristics, strengths, limitations and responsibilities of the various institutions of higher education in Maryland. CUSF authorizes its Chair to communicate its detailed concerns to MHEC

The Legislative Affairs Committee reported on a preliminary meeting with Frank Komenda, the USM legislative liaison. The Administrative and Fiscal Affairs Committee reports continued confusion about which version of the CUSF Constitution is currently in effect. Before adjourning at two o'clock p.m., we agreed to study this matter further.

**DRAFT MINUTES
CUSF MEETING
APRIL 12, 2000**

Present: BSU: Dr. Organ, Dr. Petulante; CSC: Dr. Arthur, Dr. Brooks (alt.); FSU: Dr. Ashkeboussi, Dr. Nicol; SSU: Dr. Parker; TU: Dr. Georgiou, Dr. Little, Dr. M. Siegel; UB: Dr. Gibson; UMB: Dr. Blackmon, Dr. Goldman, Dr. Havas, Dr. Proulx; UMBC: Dr. Baldwin, Dr. Choa, Dr. Coates; UMBI: Dr. Collins; UMCP: Dr. Brannigan, Dr. Smith; UMES: Dr. Chapin, UMUC: Dr. Onye; USM Dr. Bryan

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. President Hoke Smith of Towson University brought greetings from the campus, emphasizing his support for shared governance and at the same time sharing some of the areas in the current document in which he sees potential objection from some of the Presidents. In his greetings, Jack Fruchtman, the Towson Senate Chair, discussed the broadening of the Towson Senate beyond the faculty.

The minutes of the last meeting were approved as distributed.

CUSF Chair Dr. Steve Havas reported that there was discussion of the Shared Governance document in a forty-five minute closed session of the President's Council after which it was reported that the document would be passed on to System Academic Vice President Middleton to craft an adjusted version, probably in time for discussion at the May 1 CUSF Executive Committee meeting and with the Senate Chairs on May 10. Dr. Havas reported that the Faculty Awards discussion at the Board of Regents meeting had been moved up to first position, but that the placement of the CUSF report at the very end of the public meeting was still causing some difficulties. Perhaps this report might be moved to the executive session. At the BOR meeting, the matter of "insubordination" as an actionable ground for librarians came up again; there is some concern that this language might spill over into more general faculty documents. Dr. Havas also reminded us to keep matters of presidential searches, and student publication of faculty evaluations on the net as future agenda items.

The slate of officers proposed for next year was approved by unanimous consent: Dr. Bill Chapin as Chair, Dr. Martha Siegel as Vice Chair, Dr. John Collins as Secretary, and Drs. Carl Smith and Ken Baldwin as at-large members of the Executive Committee. Dr. Steve Havas will serve as Past Chair.

In reports of other external committees, we learned that the BOR Educational Policy Committee approved faculty status for librarians, that the BOR Finance Committee reported all capital projects approved without changes, that the AAAC plans to continue program review with a simpler reporting format (except those in fields like Allied Health for which there is a special statewide reporting effort), that the low productivity programs policy will permit "wild cards" to allow some programs of special value to continue despite low productivity of graduates, that the lack of sufficient funding for major K-16 action has resulted instead in the creation of a task force (with some funding) to look into the problem. Concern over centers such as Shady Grove (non-USM programs being offered, pressure put on departments from other campuses to offer programs when there are inadequate fiscal and faculty resources, unclear quality control mechanisms) led to a suggestion to invite Gertrude Eaton to come to CUSF to discuss Shady Grove and other centers. The federal Office of Civil Rights made visits to the three Historically Black Institutions in the fall (as a tag-on to MHEC visits) and is in the process of visiting other system institutions this Spring. (Dr. T. J. Bryan will get us a schedule).

Dr. Louise Michelle Gonzales, chair of the Board of Regents Educational Policy Committee, joined us for discussion. Under last year's legislation, the system has new priorities and directions, but still maintains concern for the hiring and retention of faculty, and for best educational practices that will benefit the citizens of Maryland. The question is how to set policy without micro-managing and still remain within the new State Plan, the System Plan and the realities of new technologies, globalization, and changes in student populations. She discussed the political realities involved in setting up centers like Shady Grove, the need for adequate funding for these centers, and for quality control from the institutions offering programs there. She reported that the "insubordination" terminology mentioned above did not become part of the final wording for the status of librarians document. T. J. Bryan provided us with information about the question of nine- versus nine-and-a-half month contracts for faculty. A question arose from the floor concerning possible conflict of interest in the awarding of no-bid commercial contracts to

companies making other contributions to system campuses. Another question concerned the process of conducting presidential searches: while it was recognized that there will be variation in such searches as each search committee conducts itself under its own rules, general principles such as having most of the meetings of the committees on-campus, soliciting written public response/reactions after public appearances of candidates (and announcing such appearances as far ahead of time as possible), and having some elected faculty representation on such search committees might well allow the candidate selected to come into office without the suspicion and distrust that at least one recent search evinced.

In the System Report, Dr. T. J. Bryan reported that in April and May there will be Chair's workshops on legal matters and workload, in addition to the annual workshop scheduled for November 3 at BSU (she solicited CUSF support in the planning and arrangements), that Drs. Charles Middleton and Ruth Roberts were working on the Intellectual Property Policy which would go through cycles of rewriting, as discussion took place on the campuses; and that the new State Plan was again being revised (now with the strategies removed, to be replaced by strategies proposed by the campuses). She distributed faculty salary information and reminded us of the 4% cost of living adjustment for this year and the overall 2.5 % merit money available. A motion of concern about how the monies for faculty merit are being used was made and withdrawn: Dr. Havas will write a letter to Chancellor Langenburg expressing our general concern. Representatives from each campus were asked to ascertain how merit monies were being used at their institutions. She also distributed institutional budgets, rules on faculty contracts and on faculty appointments to administrative positions and will bring Capital Budget information to our next meeting.

Discussion of the most recent version of the State Plan for Higher Education available to us included concerns about poor writing, over-emphasis on entrepreneurial and commercial concerns, the general difficulties in writing plans that apply to such diverse institutions, lack of concern for the unfettered pursuit of knowledge and learning as an end in itself for faculty and students, some of the concerns raised above about distance learning and the new centers, general lack of clarity about priorities, and insufficient mention of funding needed to carry out the goals. Dr. Larry Goldman will bring an appropriate motion for discussion at our next meeting.

Professor Carl Smith reported that there is still confusion about the two versions of our Constitution, suggesting that we should put forth the appropriate effort to have the one on our web-site declared the correct one. This item will be added to the next meeting agenda. It was also suggested that the question of collective bargaining and that of on-line faculty evaluations be added to the agenda for future meetings. Concern was expressed that we are spending too much of our time on reports and listening to visitors and not enough on substantive discussion of motions and actions of CUSF.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

University of Baltimore
May 19, 2000

Present: BSU Drs. Organ, Petulante; CSC Dr. Arthur; FSU Dr. Ashkeboussi; SSU Drs. Parker, Diriker (alt.); TU Drs. Little, M. Siegel; UB Drs. Moily, Gibson, Swain (alt.); UMB Drs. Blackmon, Goldman, Havas, Polumbo (alt.), S. Siegel; UMBI Dr. Collins; UMCP Drs. Brannigan, Falk, Smith; UMES Drs. Chapin, Noonan; UMUC Dr. Onye; USM Drs. Bryan, Langenberg.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00. Dr. Dennis Politeri, UB Vice President for Student Affairs and Dr. Peggy Potthast, newly elected UB Senate Chair, brought greetings from the campus.

During the Chair's Report, CUSF passed two unanimous motions, the first supporting the non-inclusion in the Shared Governance Document of "inclusion by reference of AAUP and AGB statements" on shared governance, the second supporting the acquisition and appropriate analysis of faculty salary data as a major CUSF concern for the coming academic year. Drs. Ashkeboussi and Little agreed to serve on the committee working with students on the publication and dissemination of student evaluation of faculty. Dr. Brannigan reported that the committee considering the process of termination of tenured faculty had not yet met.

The minutes of the meeting of the Senate Chairs and the Executive Committee of CUSF were distributed. During the discussion of that meeting, CUSF unanimously passed a motion supporting the alternative (later) due dates for campus mission statements. This would allow faculty and the Faculty Senates on the various campuses to have meaningful input in the creation of these statements.

The process of reporting "low productivity" programs (probably a misnomer, since the number of students graduated each year is not a ratio) seemed to have had little faculty involvement on the campuses, partly because the process of passing information up and down the Provost/Dean/Department Chair/Faculty Member ladder is somewhat imperfect on some of the campuses. Study of this reporting was referred to the CUSF Educational Policy Committee. Campuses individually need to verify the numbers and programs listed since the MHEC database involved seems to contain some errors. This year, in addition to the usual justifications for low graduation rate programs, Presidents, who have the decision on non-continuance of programs on their campuses, may also use a small number of "wild cards" to assure the continuance of programs considered essential (without writing the usual justification). Neither the number of wild cards nor the minimum acceptable size of the program takes into account the size of the campus in question.

Dr. Langenberg reported that major items for consideration are the much-improved State Plan for Higher Education (latest version should be up on the MHEC website shortly), the campus mission statements discussed above, and the fiscal 2002 budget. USM was about \$200 million below funding guidelines before the current year's infusion of \$80 million, so that another \$80 million next year would bring us much closer to the guidelines. Campus administrations

provide rationale for their asking budgets – monies for faculty and information technology were high on the list this year – and also determine the eventual use of funds obtained, subject to accountability both to the state system and to MHEC for achieving announced goals. Dr. Langenberg also announced that there would be action in the legislature next year again to deal with the optional retirement system and with collective bargaining, a topic made complex by considerations of what the appropriate bargaining units might be. He also announced that there would be a strong role for the Presidents next year in bringing teacher education to the center of the stage on all the campuses. In all budgetary considerations, faculty must be aware that the legislative view of reasonable times to demonstrate success is likely to be rather shorter than that of those on the campuses working to achieve the goals proposed. Quality control of programs, whether local, offered at centers like Shady Grove, or done by various sorts of distance education, remains the responsibility of the campuses and departments offering the programs.

Discussion with the Chancellor revealed concerns about faculty participation in the budgeting process (seemingly little now on most of the campuses); about faculty participation in the hiring of administrators (and in their evaluation), particularly about the apparent lack of faculty involvement in the selection of the new Provost at BSU; about the difficulties for USM-proposed programs rejected on the basis of objections by Morgan State University; about the difficulties in getting to a new agreement with the federal Office of Civil Rights; and about assuring the quality of transfer courses from community colleges and elsewhere now automatically accepted by USM.

During Dr. Bryan's report, CUSF voted support for the Faculty Contracts Policy (with minor modifications of wording) and for the policy on Faculty with Administrative Positions (with additional modifications of wording). She also distributed a report of Faculty Development Grants, and a draft study on Part-Time and Non-Tenure Track Faculty. More concerns about the wording of the State Plan for Higher Education were noted. Dr. Bryan will provide adjusted versions of all the documents discussed. One of the more difficult areas of concern with the State Plan is its justification of pure research in terms of its (fairly immediate) applications and benefits for the citizens of Maryland, with no recognition of the value of this research per se as a fundamental and essential part of the academic enterprise.

It would appear that on a number of the USM campuses, the Board of Regents policy supporting access to meaningful faculty grievance procedures is not carried out in toto. This will be a major CUSF concern for the next academic year.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20.

Minutes
CUSF Meeting
Coppin State College
June 18, 1999

Present: BSU: Gail S. Medford, John M. Organ; CES: Pat Glibert; CSC: Arthur Alcott; FSU: Rahim Ashkeboss, Dave Nicol; SSU: Thomas Erskine; TU: Martha Siegel, Joyce Curry Little;

UB: Marilyn Oblak, Stephanie Gibson; UMB: Lawrence Goldman, Lillian Blackmon, Stephen Havas, Joseph Proulx, Sharon Siegel; UMBC: Larry Lasher, Kenneth H. Baldwin, Dennis Coates, Alan D. Kreizenbeck; UMBI: John H. Collins; UMCP: Robert N. Gaines, Carl H. Smith, Frank A. Schmidlein; UMES: E. William Chapin, Steve Rebach; UMUC: Robert J. Jerome, Stanley Onye; USMH: T. J. Bryan, Charles Middleton.

In the absence of President Burnett who was attending another meeting, Professor Philips, President of the Coppin State Senate, brought greeting from the campus.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as distributed, after which both new and old members introduced themselves.

Steve Havas, for the Faculty Affairs Committee, discussed faculty governance. While the surveys done on this issue gave less complete results than desired (large percentages of Presidents and of Senate Heads responding, but small percentages of randomly selected faculty and of self-reporting faculty), it is clear that part-time faculty are frequently unrepresented in faculty governance, many faculty governance matters are handled by procedure and not by policy on the campuses, faculty governance body heads are not part of Presidential cabinets, budgetary matters are outside the shared governance system almost everywhere, campuses do not periodically survey the state of shared governance, some campuses have appointed (not elected) faculty bodies, and others have appointed (not elected) heads.

Steve Havas moved that the document entitled "Shared Governance: Definition, Rationale, Principles and Recommendations" be approved, and if approved, that the document be discussed with the Chancellor with the intent of bringing it to the Board of Regents (BOR) for the purpose of amending the 1996 BOR policy of shared governance. Discussion of this document, distributed earlier, led to several friendly amendments:

- A. Principle 5 was reworded to begin "In matters relating to curriculum, SUBJECT MATTER, AND METHODS OF INSTRUCTION, the faculty....."
- B. The last word of Principle 10 was changed from "recrimination" to "retaliation".
- C. An additional Principle was added: "In matters relating to the hiring of administrative officers (such as department chairs, deans, provosts, presidents, and system-wide administrators), (representative) faculty should have significant and active roles."
- D. To the end of Recommendation 5 was added "The governance body shall have the opportunity to submit a written rebuttal to the President or Dean in such cases. The written rebuttal -will become part of the institution or unit's permanent record on the issue."
- E. At the end of Recommendation 10 was added "This written response will become part of the permanent record on the issue."

The motion passed, 14 to 2, with the nay votes desiring stronger language (with "should" changed to "will" in numerous places). Steve Havas will take responsibility for appropriate follow-up.

Dr. Charles Middleton, the new USM Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, introduced himself and discussed some of his views. He indicated that the faculty and students, through the process of teaching and learning, are the center of the university endeavor. As an example of facilitating more and regulating less, he discussed the sixty-day time line for new program approval, allowing the campuses to compete with each other and with external institutions, supporting a strict interpretation of the new procedure (appeals only on the grounds listed, with the burden of proof of damage to an institution by a new program at another institution falling on the institution claiming potential damage) as opposed to the traditional MHEC policy of more extensive activist intervention. He noted that accountability by the Presidents for excellence in new programs begun on their campus was a natural concomitant of the new freedom in creating programs.

Concerning CUSF, Dr. Middleton indicated that he felt that one of the main forces resulting in the current strength of American higher education was the participation of faculty in governance at all institutions, but reminded us that we all live in a "12-month a year" world as far as decision-making goes, even if many of the faculty have nine and one half month contracts. On the matter of a faculty Regent, he indicated had not formed an opinion. To get to know the various institutions, Dr. Middleton is in the process of making first campus visits, garnering some information concerning on-campus attitudes by observing what and whom he is taken to see. He will be making further visits later.

The question of the extensive use of part-time faculty on some campuses elicited a response that the trend should be away from the use of many faculty each contracted to teach one or two courses toward the use of full-time appointments so that (non-tenured) practitioners from outside the university community can supply their expertise and, at the same time, contribute more fully to the life of the department (and more fully participate in the benefits of university employment). Dr. Middleton also indicated that his experience with collective bargaining so far had been in the area of non-faculty employees.

While recognizing the many sorts of expense involved in the realization of the idea of a virtual university, Dr. Middleton also reminded us that this model and the UMUC model give the USM international recognition, that we should perhaps lead the world in doing this sort of thing well.

T. J. Bryan, in the System Report, passed out information concerning faculty salaries, generally reporting a better situation this year than last year. However, differences in reporting methodology from MHEC and from USM seemingly lead to apparent inconsistencies among some of the documents in the packet, something that Dr. Bryan will investigate. Nationally, faculty salaries are growing faster than inflation and current increases would seem to be the best since 1996, although private non-church-related institutions are pulling ahead of public institutions at some ranks. Other materials in the packet distributed related to updated shared-governance survey information, information on mission statements and material to be made available through the CUSF web-page.

At this last general meeting under the leadership of Larry Lasher, the group presented our Chair for the last two years with applause, a pen, a plaque and other expressions of appreciation. Larry in turn expressed his appreciation to those members who had made special efforts on behalf of

CUSF over the years. Larry Lasher presented the report of the Executive Committee. The meeting schedule for next year is still not entirely firm, with the possible exchange of Thursday and Friday for the last two meetings (to avoid Friday traffic over the Chesapeake Bay Bridge in June), questions of the Commencement dates on some of the campuses, etc. Any further thoughts on this matter are to be passed on to the Executive Committee for resolution. Joyce Little reported on the situation of the Past Chair. She told us that the Past Chair, as a member of the Executive Committee (already in the By-Laws) has a vote there without our taking any further action. On the other hand, a proposal to make the Past Chair a non-voting member of CUSF itself will take an amendment to our constitution and so, presumably, the approval of the Board of Regents. This particular information should be considered as the announcement of a proposed amendment, to be voted on at the next general meeting. The third matter was the question of the position of the webmaster. After several friendly amendments to the wording, the follow motion was passed: "CUSF requests support from the University System of Maryland for the vital work of maintaining electronically accessible information about the council and its work, in the form of assigned time allocation or an appropriate remuneration of the 'web administrator' volunteer, in a manner similar to that now in effect for officers of the Council."

Reflection on the history of the Council led to suggestions of providing newly-elected members with information packets (including, but not limited to the Constitution the By-Laws and some information about the different campuses), suggestions of providing Council members letters of thanks for their work, the possibility of a representative on the Board of Regents, the question of the provision of meat for the noontime meal for those desiring it, and the desirability of having a Council member who could provide close liaison with the Legislature when in session

The meeting was adjourned at 1.40.

BILL CHAPIN
Secretary